

07/14/00

UTILITY PATENT APPLICATION TRANSMITTAL <small>Form for new nonprovisional applications under 37 CFR 1.53(b)</small>		Attorney Docket No.	1548-155A	Total Pages	
		First Named Inventor or Application Identifier			
		David E. Honigs et al.			
		Express Mail Label No.			
APPLICATION ELEMENTS See MPEP chapter 600 concerning utility patent application contents.			ADDRESS TO: Assistant Commissioner of Patents Box Patent Application Washington, D.C. 20231		
1. <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <small>(Submit an original, and a duplicate for fee processing)</small> 2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Specification Total pages [45] <small>(preferred arrangement set forth below)</small> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive title of the invention - Cross references to Related Applications - Statement Regarding Fed sponsored R&D - Reference to Microfiche Appendix - Background of the Invention - Brief Summary of the Invention - Brief Description of the Drawings - Detailed Description - Claims - Abstract of the Disclosure <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) (35 USC 113) Total Sheets [6] <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Oath or Declaration Total Pages [3] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Newly executed (original or copy) b. <input type="checkbox"/> Copy from a prior application <small>(37 CFR 1.63(d) (for continuation/divisional with Box 17 completed)</small> [Note Box 5 below] <input type="checkbox"/> DELETION OF INVENTOR(S) <small>Signed statement attached deleting inventor(s) named in the prior application, see 37 CFR 1.63(d)(2) and 1.33(b)</small> <input type="checkbox"/> Incorporation by Reference (useable if Box 4b is checked) The entire disclosure of the prior application, from which a copy of the oath or declaration is supplied under Box 4b, is considered as being part of the disclosure of the accompanying application and is hereby incorporated by reference therein.			6. <input type="checkbox"/> Microfiche Computer Program (Appendix) 7. Nucleotide and/or Amino Acid Sequence Submission (if applicable, all necessary) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <input type="checkbox"/> Computer Readable Copy b. <input type="checkbox"/> Paper Copy (identical to computer copy) c. <input type="checkbox"/> Statement verifying identity of above copies ACCOMPANYING APPLICATION PARTS 8. <input type="checkbox"/> Assignment Papers (cover sheet & document(s)) 9. <input type="checkbox"/> 37 CFR 3.73(b) Statement <small>(when there is an assignee)</small> <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney 10. <input type="checkbox"/> English Translation Document (if applicable) 11. <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement /PTO 1449 <input type="checkbox"/> Copies of IDS Citations 12. <input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Amendment 13. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Return Receipt Postcard (MPEP 503) <small>(Should be specifically itemized)</small> 14. <input type="checkbox"/> Small Entity Statement(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Statement Filed in prior application, Status still proper and desired 15. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s). <small>(if foreign priority is claimed)</small> 16. <input type="checkbox"/> Other:		
17. If a CONTINUING APPLICATION, check appropriate box and supply the requisite information: <input type="checkbox"/> Continuation <input type="checkbox"/> Divisional <input type="checkbox"/> Continuation-in-part (CIP) of prior application No.:					
18. CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS <input type="checkbox"/> Customer Number or Bar Code Label or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Correspondence address below <small>(Insert Customer No. or Attach bar code label here)</small>					
Name	Vincent M. DeLuca, Reg. No. 32,408				
Address	Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck Suite 701-East, 555 13th Street, N.W.				
City	Washington	State	D.C.	Zip Code	20004
Country	U.S.A.	Telephone	202-783-6040	Fax	202-783-6031

 07/14/00
 09/16/00
 1548-155A
 P.D. 6
 1617046

09:07:045.071400

**CALIBRATION OF NEAR INFRARED QUANTITATIVE MEASUREMENT
DEVICE USING OPTICAL MEASUREMENT CROSS-PRODUCTS**

Field Of The Invention

5 The present invention relates to instruments for the
non-invasive quantitative measurement of constituents,
such as blood glucose levels in blood. More
specifically, this invention provides improvements in
methods and apparatus for near-infrared quantitative
10 analysis.

Background And Related Prior Art

15 The use of quantitative near-infrared ("NIR")
analysis for the determination of chemical and/or
physical characteristics of products is relatively well
known in the art. See "An Introduction to Near Infrared
Quantitative Analysis," by Robert D. Rosenthal, presented
at the 1977 Annual Meeting of the American Association of
Cereal Chemists, (1978). See also U.S. Pat. No.
20 4,286,327 issued to Rosenthal et al. on Aug. 25, 1981.

 Another well-known application of NIR analysis
relates to the quantitative measurement of analytes in
mammals, such as quantitative analysis of glucose in the
blood. Information concerning the chemical composition
25 of blood is widely used to assess the health

characteristics of both people and animals. More specifically, analysis of the glucose content of blood provides an indication of the current status of the metabolism. Blood analysis, by the detection of above or below normal levels of various substances, also provides a direct indication of the presence of certain types of diseases and dysfunctions.

In particular, the non-invasive NIR quantitative measurement apparatus has particular application for use by diabetics in monitoring the level of glucose in the blood. See U.S. Pat. No. 5,028,787, Rosenthal et al., issued Jul. 2, 1991, the subject matter of which is hereby incorporated by reference in its entirety.

Quantitative NIR analysis is based on the principle that most organic (and some inorganic) substances absorb radiation in the near-infrared range, with the different substances having different absorption characteristics over specific NIR wavelength ranges. These different characteristics are then used to formulate specific measurement algorithms for obtaining quantitative information regarding the presence of such substances in the subject sample, product or patient.

The above-cited '327 patent teaches the use of infrared emitting diodes (IREDs) as sources of near-infrared radiation. As shown in FIG. 1, a plurality (eight in the figure) of IREDs 10 is arranged over a

sample WS to be illuminated for quantitative analysis. Near-infrared radiation emitted from each IRED impinges upon an accompanying optical filter 12. Each optical filter 12 is a narrow bandpass filter that passes NIR radiation at a different wavelength, and light baffles 14 are provided between IREDs to prevent an IRED's light from being transmitted through an adjacent filter. In the illustrated example, the sample WS is held in a holder 16 having a transparent bottom 18. NIR radiation passing through the sample and the holder is detected by a detector 20, such as a silicon photodetector, and converted to an electrical signal. The electrical signal is processed by processing circuitry, including an amplifier 22, logarithmic amplifier 23, and analog-to-digital converter 24, and inputted to microprocessor 11. The microprocessor processes the data from the detector, using preprogrammed algorithms to obtain a quantitative measurement of the analytes of interest in the sample, and outputs the result on a display 26.

FIG. 2 illustrates another known NIR instrument for non-invasive measurement of blood analytes, as disclosed in U.S. Pat. No. 5,077,476, issued to Rosenthal on Dec. 31, 1991. The subject matter of the '476 patent is also incorporated by reference herein in its entirety. In brief summary, the instrument 1 uses a number of IREDs

69617046.071400

(50, 60 as shown in FIG. 2) for irradiating a body part, such as the finger, with NIR radiation at selected wavelengths. Narrow bandpass optical filters 160 and 170 are positioned at the output of the IREDs to pass NIR radiation at a selected wavelength. The radiation passes through a window 140, through the subject, and is detected by a detector 80. A light baffle 40 is provided to isolate the various IREDs to prevent radiation from one IRED passing through the optical filter associated with a different IRED.

The detector 80 outputs a signal to a microprocessor 100 through amplifier 90. The microprocessor calculates the concentration of analytes at issue (such as blood glucose) using preprogrammed algorithms and outputs the results to a display device 180. In this instrument, timing and control circuitry 110 is provided to sequentially and individually turn on and off each IRED, one at a time, so that the absorption by the blood analytes and other substances may be measured at each particular wavelength specified in the measurement algorithm.

In almost all known NIR measurement devices, such as those described above, the preprogrammed algorithms for interpreting the quantitative measurements are based upon Beer's Law, which provides that the amount of chemical

constituent(s) to be measured is linearly related to **D**,
where

$$D = \log\left(\frac{1}{I}\right), \quad \text{(Equation 1)}$$

in which **I** can be the fraction of light that is either
transmitted through an object, reflected off an object or
interacted with the object. This linear concept has
worked quite well in many NIR measurement applications.
For example, Patent No. 4,928,014, issued May 22, 1990 to
Rosenthal, provides for the measurement of body fat in
the human body using an NIR measurement device.

These historical successes using Beer's Law have
been in applications where the change in constituent
concentration has been modest. For example, in the
measurement of body fat, as taught by the '014 patent,
the percentage of body fat varies from a minimum in the
neighborhood of 10% to a maximum of approximately 40%, a
four to one change. In contrast, a much larger range of
concentration change occurs in certain blood analytes.
For example, blood glucose molality can vary from 20
mg/dL to more than 500 mg/dL, a change of twenty-five to
one. Over such large ranges of values, the basic
assumption in Beer's Law of linearity may be invalid. As
a result, conventional Multiple Linear Regression ("MLR")
or factor analysis does not provide sufficient accuracy
to be meaningful. In fact, the **D** values, as defined in

Equation 1, from the NIR measurement of blood glucose values generally have a highly nonlinear relationship.

Attempts to use an NIR device to measure blood glucose have encountered many problems. The NIR measurement devices must be calibrated for each individual user, with more accurate calibrations resulting in more accurate readings. It is generally tedious and time consuming to accurately calibrate the NIR measurement device. During the calibration, measurements of the NIR device are compared with other measurements known to be accurate. The NIR device is then adjusted to produce measurements that correspond with the measurements known to be accurate. The conventional approach for the NIR calibration is to evaluate absorption wavelengths and reference wavelengths. The absorption wavelengths are the portions of the electro-magnetic spectrum with high absorbance due to the particular constituents of interest, and reference wavelengths are the portions of the spectrum that are insensitive to the particular constituents. However, in the very near infrared portion of the spectrum, from 700 nm to 1100 nm, the absorptions are quite broad, and thus, independent selection of wavelengths is difficult. Moreover, in the case of *in vivo* measurement of various blood analytes through a body part, the problem is even more difficult. Approximately ninety-nine percent of the

organic content of a finger is due to the presence of water, fat and muscle (protein). The remaining 1 percent includes all of the blood analytes to be measured, as well as other materials. Even further complicating the NIR measurement is that blood analytes, such as blood glucose, are very weak NIR absorbers. There thus exists the overall challenge of measuring a very minute quantity of a substance that is a weak absorber in the presence of very strong absorbers in a portion of the spectrum where individual absorption characteristics are not easily recognizable.

Thus, there presently exists a need for an improved methodology to produce an accurate NIR measurement over a large range of possible values. Furthermore, the methodology needs to allow for the calibration of an NIR instrument to achieve the accurate, non-invasive measurement of blood analytes, especially weak absorbers such as blood glucose.

Accordingly, there is further need for a methodology that is able to calibrate an NIR blood glucose measurement unit so that the calibration is usable over a wide range of values. More specifically, the methodology needs to be accurate at the low and high glucose values so that NIR measurement device is of value in diagnosing and preventing hypoglycemia and hyperglycemia. The methodology needs to provide sufficient accuracy for

medical use, so the method should provide a calibration that produces accuracy at least equal to the home finger stick meters used during the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial (DCCT). Furthermore, the methodology
5 needs to produce a calibration that is robust and, therefore, able to accurately predict blood glucose over a reasonably extended period of time and to minimize the need for recalibration.

Summary Of The Invention

10 In response to these needs, the present invention provides a method that better analyzes the near infrared ("NIR") measurement data terms to achieve a better calibration of the NIR measurement device to the specific
15 user. The method uses the codependence of data to extract additional information from the NIR measurement device. Codependence of the data terms is represented in cross-product terms. The cross-product terms are formed in the first step of the method by using the data terms
20 from the NIR measurement device. Then in the second step, statistical analysis is performed using the data terms and the cross-product terms to find a desirable calibration. During this second step, randomly generated sets of the data terms and the cross-product terms are
25 tested to find a best solution, according to prespecified conditions. More specifically, the invention includes a

means to select randomly a desirable combination of data and cross-product terms to produce a good calibration to improve the predictability of blood analyte measurements.

Brief Description Of The Drawings

The invention will be described in detail with reference to the following drawings in which:

FIGS. 1-2 (Prior Art) are schematic diagrams of known Near Infrared measurement devices;

FIG. 3 is a flow diagram detailing a method in accordance with an embodiment of the present invention; and

FIGS. 4-6 are charts illustrating experimental results of implementing the present invention.

Detailed Description Of The Preferred Embodiments

FIG. 3 illustrates a method for improving the calibration of a near infrared ("NIR") measurement device. In this method, a plurality of data terms is formed for the NIR measurement device, step 200, using known means. Then, terms representing the codependence of the data terms are formed, step 210, generally in the form of a cross-product. A cross-product, also called the covariance, is a measure of the codependence of data variables.

In the past, NIR analysis of nonlinear data may have included the basic optical measurements and even some of the optical measurements being raised to a power.

However, no one examined the relationships of the various

5 optical measurements. These relationships may provide much useful information. For instance, absorption of either a first wavelength or a second wavelength may provide little information on the quantity of a substance, while the simultaneous absorption of both
10 wavelengths may be a strong measurement tool. However, no one has used the cross-product terms of the optical measurements by an NIR device. The reason for this avoidance of the cross-product terms is probably a holdover from Beer's Law that provides, as described
15 above, that the variables are linear and separable. Also, most mathematical textbooks focus on teaching partial differentiation in cases where the variables can be separated to avoid difficult computations. In fact, difficult and tedious computations are generally required
20 to solve inseparable differential equations.

As previously provided, the cross-product terms represent the interaction between two more variables. By using the cross-products, it is assumed that the variables are not separable and cannot be individually
25 defined. An example of clearly nonseparable variables can be seen in light transmission through a finger. The

amount of water in the finger not only affects light absorption but also light scattering in conjunction with other factors. Thus, light energy absorption and light energy scattering are dependent information that cannot be separated.

The basic idea for cross-products is well known and can be described using a power series expansion to describe the relationship of two variables, **X** and **Y**:

- a zero order polynomial expansion is a constant;
- a first order polynomial expansion has a constant, **Y** and **X**; and
- a second order polynomial expansion may have the following terms: a constant, **X**, **Y**, **X²**, **Y²**, and **X \otimes Y**, where **X \otimes Y** represents the cross-product of **X** and **Y**.

Performing NIR measurements using linear approximations based on Beer's Law, i.e., fitting the data to a straight line, is equivalent to using the first order polynomial expansion.

In a typical near-infrared instrument, such as the ones described in the '787 and '476 patents, a limited number of discrete optical measurements are made at different wavelengths. When discrete optical measurements are made at **n** different wavelengths, there will **n** first order terms having the form

$$D_i,$$

(Equation 2)

where $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, the subscript i identifies which wavelength is being measured, and D_i is $\text{Log} (I_i)^{-1}$ at the wavelength corresponding to i , as previously described in equation 1.

5 In one known NIR measurement device, individual discrete measurements are made at 14 different wavelengths in the spectra of interest. The measurement produces fourteen discrete optical terms in the very near infrared spectra, and the first order terms would be D_1 ,
10 D_2, \dots, D_{14} .

If second order terms are used, including the cross-products, the second order terms would be

$$D_i \otimes D_j,$$

(Equation 3)

where $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $i \leq j$, and the subscripts i and j identify wavelengths that are being measured. Thus, in
15 the above-described NIR measurement device that makes individual discrete measurements at 14 different wavelengths in the spectra of interest, the cross-products from the second order are $D_1 \otimes D_1, \dots, D_1 \otimes D_{14}, D_2 \otimes D_2, \dots,$
 $D_{14} \otimes D_{14}$. There will be

$$\frac{1}{2} \times n \times (n+1)$$

(Equation 4)

second order terms. For instance, with fourteen first order terms there are 105 distinct second order terms.

Similarly, if third order terms are considered, they would be of the form

$$D_i \otimes D_j \otimes D_k, \quad (\text{Equation 5})$$

5 where i, j and $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $i \leq j \leq k$, and the subscripts i, j and k identify which of the n wavelengths are being measured. For example, in an NIR measurement device that makes individual discrete measurements at fourteen different wavelengths in the spectra of
10 interest, the third order terms are $D_1 \otimes D_1 \otimes D_1, \dots, D_1 \otimes D_1 \otimes D_{14}, \dots, D_{14} \otimes D_{14} \otimes D_{14}$. There will be

$$\frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{3} \times n \times (n+1) \times (n+2) \quad (\text{Equation 6})$$

unique third order terms. Thus, with fourteen first order terms, there are 560 distinct third order terms.

In a preferred embodiment of the present invention,
15 both first, second, and third order terms are considered during the statistical analysis. As can be seen from Equations 5 and 6, the number of possible terms rapidly increases when considering second and third order terms. For instance, the NIR measurement device that makes
20 individual discrete measurements at 14 different wavelengths produces a total of 679 first, second and third order terms. This large number of potential terms

00517015-071400

5 makes it difficult to use the cross-products terms to calibrate the NIR measurement device. Present statistical techniques and limits on the number of sample data do not allow for the fast and simple statistical analysis of large number of data terms.

10 As seen in FIG. 3, the next step of the method of the present invention, step 220, is to perform statistical analysis on the data terms and the cross-product terms. However, as described above, there tends to be a large total number of data and cross-product terms.

15 In statistics, it is well known to approximate the results of a large population by sampling a small representative group. For example, the outcome of an election may be reliably predicted by sampling a small group of voters. A meaningful statistical result for the total population of the United States, with a reasonable confidence of 95%, may be achieved by polling as few as 1,000 people.

20 The present invention applies the same concept to the potentially large set of the first, second and third order terms by randomly selecting smaller subsets of terms to obtain an optimal calibration. For convenience, this approach is entitled "Monte Carlo Regression." In
25 this approach, a number of variable terms are randomly selected, step 230, and used in a statistical analysis

such as Multiple Linear Regression ("MLR"), step 250. Many statistical techniques to analyze data are known and may be used. For instance, it is known to use Nonlinear Regression Analysis ("NRA") for curve fitting to find a nonlinear equation that best fits a set of data values. In using NRA, the final solution may be in the form of polynomial, exponential, logistic, periodic, or general nonlinear functions.

The random selection and analysis of the steps 230 and 250 continue until a desired solution is produced, or a certain number of iterations are achieved, step 260. Then random selection and analysis of the steps 230 and 250 may be repeated with a different number of data terms, step 270.

To implement the Monte Carlo Regression, a computer program is written to include all the available potential regression terms. In the case of fourteen first order terms, the computer program may access all 679 possible first, second, and third order terms. The program further includes data that contains the results of readings of samples made with the NIR device as well as accurate measurements of the same samples taken from other known methods, such as laboratory testing.

One issue that arises is how to select from the multitude of possible measurement terms be included in the NIR calibration analysis. For example, in a typical

NIR calibration there may be 150 optical measurement samples, e.g., 150 different measurements from the NIR device to be compared to the results of laboratory measurements. With 150 samples, up to twenty potential
5 variable terms could be included in the calibration analysis because robust calibration design requires at least seven samples per variable term. Thus, the question is how to select the best subset of terms from the large set of first, second third order terms.

10 The computer program accepts an inputted number **A** or a range of numbers **A₁** through **A₂** that represents the number or numbers of desired variable regression terms to be analyzed at a time by the computer. For example, the number of variables could be limited to 15, 25 or any
15 other integer. With fourteen first order terms, the computer may typically search for the best selection of twelve through twenty-two variable terms. It should be understood however, that any number **A** of terms may be used.

20 In performing statistical analysis, it is recognized that the more variable terms that are included, the better the statistical result would appear to be. However, such better results may cause poorer forward prediction capability because they may be overfitting the
25 data.

Normally, it would be preferred to have an independent set of samples that could be used in a prediction mode to test the robustness of the calibration. Unfortunately, this is simply not possible with the NIR measurement of many materials, such as blood glucose.

Historically, this type of problem was resolved by limiting the total number of variables so that the number of samples per variable was above some threshold. For example, it is typical to use ten samples per variable as the minimum amount used. When using 10 samples per variable, at least 150 samples are required to analyze fifteen variables. In the technical literature, it is generally recommended that at least five or six samples per variable term be used.

The following table provides the limit on the number of variables, i.e., the number of regression terms, that could be used from 150 samples. As seen in the table, the number of variables depends on the number of samples per variable.

TABLE 1

Number of Samples Per Variable	Number of Variables from 150 Sample Calibrations
4	38
5	30
6	25
7	21

8	19
9	17
10	15

5 Generally, the calibration is limited to at least seven samples per variable or a maximum of 20 calibration terms from 150 samples.

10 The computer program may also accept a second input **B** that represents the number of iterations or regression attempts to be performed (such as one million) for each number of variable terms being analyzed. With greater **B** values, the program produces more accurate results but runs for longer time periods because of the increased number of computations.

15 The program then randomly selects and saves **A** terms from the data set of multiple possible terms and performs the statistical analysis. The program then randomly selects another set of **A** terms and repeats the analysis. The program replaces the first set with the second set if
20 the statistical analysis shows the second set to be better, i.e., to have higher correlation coefficient than the first set of terms. The program continues this process of random selection and regression analysis until it has completed all **B** iterations. At this point, the
25 program provides the calibration constants and the

statistics for the best combination of **A** terms it found in the **B** attempts.

Obviously, there may be better combinations that were not randomly selected by the program after **B** iterations. However, studies have shown that any improvement by additional iterations (for example, using 100 million iterations instead of one million) is quite small.

Then in step 280, this best solution is selected. In using the Monte Carlo program with a large number of variable terms, such as twenty, it is possible to derive extremely large calibration constant value **K**, sometimes more than 300,000. The reason for this result is that the statistical analysis of step 250 derives the best possible fit. Sometimes that fit results in overfitting, which contorts the calibration by deriving very large calibration constants.

The Monte Carlo program may provide, along with a best answer, some different answers that are almost as good. Normally, some of these next best answers have calibration constants that are more reasonable but result in minor degradation of the calibration statistics. Thus, an alternative set of calibration terms may be selected based upon the following criteria:

- 1) The Figure of Merit ("FM") of the calibration would not be diminished more than 0.2, where FM

is defined as the range of laboratory data,
i.e., the highest lab value minus the lowest
lab value, divided by two times the standard
error of deviation, and

- 5 2) The calibration constants are significantly
reduced compared to the best solution.

Accordingly, in a preferred embodiment of the present
invention, the step of selecting the best solution, step
280, is achieved by selecting a solution with a high FM
value and a reasonable calibration constant.

10 In addition, once the program finds the best
solution for the **A** numbered wavelength terms, the program
may optionally perform a cross validation study on this
best result, step 290, as part of selecting the best
15 solution. During the cross validation study, the set of
the **A** best terms produced during the above process are
further analyzed as follows:

- 20 (1) The program first leave out the first sample
and uses the wavelength terms to do a linear
regression of the remaining **A-1** samples to
derive a new set of calibration constants. The
program then multiplies these new calibration
constants with the optical data of the first
sample to obtain and store a predicted value
25 for the first sample.

(2) The program then returns the removed sample to the data set, removes a second sample and repeats the regression analysis with the remaining **A-1** samples. Then, the program would again use the results of the regression analysis to form and store a prediction of the removed second sample.

(3) The program continues this process of removing and predicting samples until all samples in the best solution set have been predicted using the remaining members of the set. The program then take compares the predicted sample values to the actual sample values to give an overall indication of the quality of the calibration.

However, as suggested above, the best calibration result may not provide the best prediction result for calibration. Accordingly, the program allows a user to input a variable **N** that directs the program to save the **N** solutions that have the closest correlation to the single best solution. In a typical case, the program saves ten solutions and performs cross validation on all ten. The program then selects the solution that produces the best cross validation result.

When the user specifies a range of numbers, **A₁** through **A₂**, the same procedure will be then repeated for subsets with **A₁+1** variables, then subsets with **A₁+2**

variables, and so on until the program reaches the A_2 limit. Thus, a best solution may be selected for each of the selected sizes for the data term subset. Then, the program compares the best solution for each of the sizes of the data term subsets to find an overall best solution, step 300. The overall best solution is the subset that provides the solution having highest cross validation correlation.

The approach of the present invention may be further adapted to included other types of measurement data as part of the step of creating the data terms, step 200, because other physical parameters may provide additional information concerning blood glucose level. To use these other measurements, the program is amended to include additional data terms for consideration during the Monte Carlo Regression. These other parameters include the test subject's pulse rate and the logarithmic value of the pulse rate. The pulse rate may be easily measured by the NIR measurement device when taking the blood glucose levels. Another pair of possible parameters are the test subject's finger temperature and the logarithmic value of the finger temperature, as described in U.S. Patent No. 4,466,076 issued on August 14, 1984 to Rosenthal, the entire subject matter of which is also incorporated by reference. The method of present invention may further consider the time period from previous meals. For

instance, the program may consider various "meal data" terms, such as the six variables described in U.S. Serial No. 09/073,941 filed on May 6, 1998 by Rosenthal, the entire subject matter of which is hereby incorporated by reference.

In addition to these ten terms, the IRED temperature and the NIR detector temperature, along with the logarithmic values of the IRED temperature and the detector temperature, may improve the calibration of the NIR measurement device. However, the use of these temperature terms may be risky because they may provide a false data correlation during data analysis. For this reason, these four temperature terms are generally not used.

The calibration may be further improved by using the NIR measurement data from more than one finger. More specifically, if a single finger is used in the calibration, then the forward prediction capability of the instrument diminishes, and in fact, disappears after a short period of time, such as in weeks. The reason for this loss in prediction ability is believed to be due to changes in the chemical composition of the finger. As previously discussed, a typical finger has approximately 55% to 80% water, 5% to 35% fat and 4% to 12% muscle. Over an extended period of time, a finger's water-to-fat ratio will change. It is believed that this change is

one reason that single finger calibrations do not have the robustness in predicting blood glucose.

The use of three different fingers in the calibration provides a more robust calibration.

5 Typically, NIR measurements are taken from the index, the middle or the ring fingers. The spectral data generally shows large differences in the water-to-moisture ratios for these three fingers. For example, the ring finger has the most fat, and the index finger has the least
10 amount of fat. Thus, taking a measurement of three fingers during each a laboratory reading, the calibration is able to account for a large change in internal chemistry of a single finger that may occur over time, as well as changes in the size of the finger that may occur
15 in the future.

While the use of three fingers will diminish the apparent accuracy of the calibration of the unit, the practice produces a more robust calibration that allows better long-term predictions.

20 Another benefit of this three-finger calibration approach is that it significantly reduces the number of finger sticks, i.e., laboratory measurements, required during the calibration process. For example, if the calibration program requires 150 samples, this number of
25 samples could be generated using only fifty finger stick readings. Reducing the number of finger stick readings

produces a considerable savings in cost and time while performing the calibration. For example, if a typical person tests one finger four times a day during the calibration procedure, it would require 38 days to generate 150 calibration samples. If the person tests three fingers four times per day, it would only require thirteen days to generate the same number of samples.

As described above, the accuracy of the calibration is decreased by using measurements from three fingers. This loss of accuracy can be minimized by the following procedure that skews the calibration in favor of the finger to be measured:

- 1) Decide what finger is to be used for future measurements (usually the left index finger);
- 2) Duplicate all data for that finger three times; and
- 3) Add these duplicates to the set of reliable readings.

With the above approach, approximately two-thirds of the total samples in the calibration file will be of the selected finger. The other third will be equally split between the other two fingers.

In another embodiment, NIR readings are taken from three fingers from both of a user's hands. Then the above described procedure is repeated for each hand.

09517045-071400
CONFIDENTIAL

This approach can be logically explained by considering all the calibration samples to have a normal, i.e., bell shape, distribution. The test of selected finger being duplicated three times can be considered fitting within the one standard deviation limit, which is approximately 68% of all samples. The other two fingers which numerically correspond to approximately 33% of the total can be considered as the samples outside the standard deviation.

The example below illustrates the improvements in calibration accuracy from the use of second order and third order optical terms. This improvement in the calibration accuracy is generally significant. For instance, the use of second and third order terms typically almost doubles the coefficient of determination.

EXAMPLE 1

FIG. 4 illustrates a calibration performed on a diabetic individual for blood glucose measurement with an NIR device that uses the fourteen wavelengths. Using first order terms from the fourteen basic wavelengths provided a cross validation correlation of 0.710, bar A in FIG. 4. As illustrated in the next bar, B, using the combination of first and second order terms provided a cross validation correlation of 0.806. The next bar to

the right, C illustrates the result of using the combination of first, second and third order terms and provides an improved result of 0.816. The use of nonoptical data terms, along with the combination of first, second and third order optical terms, improved cross validation correlation to 0.898, column F.

FIG. 5 illustrates the effect of adjusting the number of variable terms used, as shown by the standard error of the calibration and the standard error of cross validation. The key parameter is the standard error of cross validation because it is a measure of the predictability of the calibration. In this instance, the best result was achieved using nineteen terms that included a combination of first, second and third order optical terms as well as some physical terms. Thus, using the larger numbers of terms may not improve the calibration.

The benefits of the method of the present invention are further illustrated in FIG. 6 that summarizes the average of six randomly chosen NIR measurement devices from a fourteen-day home calibration study. The most left "bar" in FIG. 6 is the Coefficient Of Determination (the correlation coefficient squared) when using only the First Order terms. The next bar to the right shows that the Coefficient Of Determination is much greater when the first, second and third order terms are used. The third

bar from the left in FIG. 6 demonstrates the improvement to Coefficient of Determination by combining the "physical terms" with the optical terms. All results presented in Fig. 6 were produced with the Monte Carlo approach using twenty variables, except for the leftmost bar that used only the fourteen first order terms. In addition, all data in this example were derived using the weighted three finger approach.

The above-results, illustrated in FIGS. 4-6, were obtained using a relatively lowcost personal computer, having a 400 MHz **Celeron**® Processor produced by the Intel Corporation of Santa Clara, California. The computer was able to complete one million interactions in approximately one hour. Thus, the approach described herein is practical, economical and easily achievable.

As part of the step of analyzing the ability of the data terms subsets to predict the results of reliable measurements, step 250, the method of the present invention may be optionally adapted to skew the reliable measurements to produce nonoptimal calibrations that provide better results over a desired data range, step 240. The need for this step is now discussed.

One characteristic of using statistical analysis is that the accuracy of predicted samples at the low end and high end of the calibration range may not be as good as the accuracy in the middle of the calibration range.

Moreover, if the calibration range is very large, as is true in the NIR blood glucose measurement system, then the predicted values of low glucose samples tend to be much higher than the actual value, causing an unacceptable risk of hypoglycemia. Similarly, the predicted values of high glucose samples tend to be much lower than actual values, limiting the usefulness of the NIR measurement device in hyperglycemic control. Moreover, the predicted values of samples in the middle part of the glucose range may also have large glucose errors, over or under the actual values, because the statistical analysis attempts to fix a line between the high and low glucose samples.

Research using an NIR device to predict octane numbers in gasoline has shown that increasing the number of samples at the low end of the range of possible values provides a calibration that improves prediction values at the low end of the range of values. The number of samples at the low end of the range of values may be increased by simply repeating the same samples that exist at the low end some number of times. For instance, the same low-end values may be used ten times. However, this new low calibration will have less accuracy over the entire range, especially at the high end of the range of possible values.

Similarly, increasing the number of samples at the high end of the possible range of values achieves a much better calibration for predicting high value. Again, the number of samples may be increased by simply reusing or repeating the samples having high levels of the measured material. The high end calibration will have less accuracy over the entire range, especially at the low end of the range of possible values.

Unfortunately, there is no known method of determining the number of duplicates to choose, and what limits to establish for the low end and for the high end.

In response to this problem, a multistep, parametric approach may be used to improve the calibration. This approach is discussed with reference to blood glucose testing, but is not limited to that application. The multistep approach is equally applicable to any NIR measurements. For instance, in blood glucose measurements, the "Low Region" is defined as glucose values less than 120 mg/dL. This Low Region is further subdivided into three subsections: Low Region 1 that ranges from 100 to 120 mg/dL; Low Region 2 that ranges from 99 to 70 mg/dL; and Low Region 3 that includes values below 70 mg/dL. The three Low regions are evaluated in three steps. In the first evaluation step, the new set calibration data is created to include all samples plus a duplicate of the samples in Low Region 1,

two duplicates of the samples in Low Region 2, and three
duplicates of the samples in Low Region 3. In the second
step, a second new calibration data file is created that
includes all samples plus a single duplicate of the
5 samples in Low Region 1, three duplicates of the samples
in Low Region 2, and five duplicates of the samples in
Low Region 3. In the third step, a third new calibration
data file is created that includes all samples plus two
duplicates of the samples in Low Region 1, five
10 duplicates of the samples in Low Region 2, and ten
duplicates of the samples in Low Region 3. The procedure
thus provides three separate Low calibration files to be
evaluated using the general Monte Carlo approach.

For the purpose of blood glucose measurements, the
15 "High Region" is defined as containing all samples that
have glucose values greater than 240 mg/dL. This High
Region is further subdivided into three Sections: High
Region 1 with blood glucose levels between 240 and 295
mg/dL; High Region 2 with blood glucose levels between
20 296 and 350 mg/dL; and High Region 3 with blood glucose
levels between 351 and 400 mg/dL. The High Regions are
evaluated in three alternate steps. In the first step, a
new calibration data file is created that includes all
samples plus a duplicate of the samples in region High 1,
25 two duplicates of the samples in region High 2, and three
duplicates of the samples in region High 3. In the

second step, a second new calibration data file is created that includes all samples plus a single duplicate of the samples in region High 1, three duplicates of the samples in region High 2, and five duplicates of the samples in region High 3. In the third step, a third new calibration data file is created that includes all samples plus two duplicates of the samples in region High 1, five duplicates of the samples in region High 2, and ten duplicates of the samples in region High 3. The above procedure provides three separate High calibration files to be evaluated using the Monte Carlo approach.

In blood glucose tests, the "Mid Region" is defined as all samples that were between 121 and 239 mg/dL. This Mid Region may also be evaluated by generating three alternate calibration files. One new calibration data file includes all calibration samples plus one duplicate of the samples in the Mid Region. In a second calibration file, the samples in the Mid Region are duplicated three times. In a third calibration file, the samples in the Mid Region are duplicated five times.

The Monte Carlo Program then provides the statistical analysis results for ten different calibration files: the original data file, the three "Low Region" files, the three "High Region" files, and three "Mid Region" files. An appropriate calibration result may then be selected according to the needs of the user.

0001120 94021966

The use of the alternative calibration is now described in greater detail. FM values are determined for the terms of the data term set. If the FM value is acceptable, such as 2.5 or greater, Monte Carlo analysis is performed on all nine Low, Mid and High Regions data files, defined above, as well as the original calibration. More specifically, a preferred embodiment uses the following criteria:

- (A) if $FM < 2.5$, the calibration is unreliable and should not be used;
- (B) if $2.5 \leq FM \leq 2.9$, the calibration is usable but with caution;
- (C) if $3.0 \leq FM \leq 4.9$, there is a good calibration; and
- (D) if $FM < 5.0$, the calibration is excellent.

Each of the ten different data sets is then used to determine a separate set of optimum wavelengths terms and their associated calibration constants. With an NIR device with fourteen first order wavelength terms and original 150 NIR measurement samples, it is typical to seek approximately twenty optimum wavelengths terms for each of the ten calibrations, as described above.

Using the ten different calibrations allows the NIR measurement device to derive more accurate glucose values over the large range of possible values. For simplicity, the following discussion assumes that there is only one

Low calibration, only one High calibration and only one Mid calibration. However, it should be appreciated that multiple Low, Mid, and High calibrations may be performed, and optimally, nine Low, Mid, and High calibrations are performed.

First, the glucose level of the sample is predicted using the Low Range calibration's wavelengths and constants. If the predicted result is below 120 mg/dL, the NIR measurement device is calibrated using the Low Range calibration's wavelengths and constants.

If the predicted result using the Low Range calibration is above 120 mg/dL, the glucose level of the sample is first predicted using the High Range calibration. If the predicted result from High Range calibration is greater than 240 mg/dL, the NIR measurement device is calibrated using the High Range calibration's wavelengths and constants.

If neither the Low Range nor the High Range calibrations are used, the measurement then is predicted from the sample data using the MID Range calibration. If the predicted result with the Mid Range calibration is between 120 and 240 mg/dL, the NIR measurement device uses the Mid Range's calibration wavelengths and constants.

Otherwise, the NIR measurement device is calibrated using the basic calibration without any duplication of sample data in any of the ranges.

5 The NIR blood glucose determinations from using the selected calibration are then placed into a data file, including the number of samples and their laboratory values. Using this data file, the calibration statistics are determined for comparison to using various criteria, such as above-described protocol for the FM values to
10 determine if the calibration is acceptable.

In one embodiment, there are 27 combinations of the three Low Range, the three High Range, and the three Mid Range calibrations to be evaluated. The following table
15 illustrates the results of a calibration using this embodiment of the calibration method. The experiment used the various alternative calibrations to find the calibration with the highest correlation and FM value (shown in bold).

TABLE 2

Low/High Thresholds

Low = 120
High = 240

	Filename	# Samples	LoGlucose	HiGlucose
	-----	-----	-----	-----
Input Data File:	4002CG.ALL	312	55	372
High 1	40020020.C01	474	20	400
High 2	40020120.C01	486	20	400
High 3	40020220.C01	624	20	400
Low 1	40020320.C01	444	20	400
Low 2	40020420.C01	456	20	400
Low 3	40020520.C01	576	20	400
Middle 1	40020620.C01	474	20	400
Middle 2	40020720.C01	798	20	400
Middle 3	40020820.C01	1122	20	400
Unweighted	40020920.C01	312	20	400

ALL FINGERS

	----- Calibration Results - Middle 1 -----									
	1-Touch Average	High 1 Low 1	High 1 Low 2	High 1 Low 3	High 2 Low 1	High 2 Low 2	High 2 Low 3	High 3 Low 1	High 3 Low 2	High 3 Low 3
Average	184.3	188.7	187.3	186.4	190.3	189.0	188.0	192.8	191.4	190.5
Std Dev	76.8	67.2	68.4	69.5	68.9	70.1	71.3	71.6	72.8	73.9

- Basic Stats -

Correlation	0.726	0.740	0.735	0.750	0.762	0.758	0.748	0.760	0.756
Std Err Pred	54.146	53.011	53.665	52.415	51.242	51.918	53.594	52.448	53.108
Figure Merit	2.932	2.995	2.958	3.029	3.098	3.058	2.962	3.027	2.989

- With Bias Correction -

Bias	-4.3	-3.0	-2.0	-6.0	-4.6	-3.7	-8.5	-7.1	-6.2
Average	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3
Std Dev	67.2	68.4	69.5	68.9	70.1	71.3	71.6	72.8	73.9
Correlation	0.726	0.740	0.735	0.750	0.762	0.758	0.748	0.760	0.756
Std Err Pred	53.971	52.928	53.625	52.066	51.030	51.783	52.916	51.963	52.745
Figure Merit	2.941	2.999	2.960	3.049	3.111	3.066	3.000	3.055	3.010

- With Slope/Bias Correction -

Slope	0.830	0.831	0.812	0.835	0.834	0.816	0.802	0.801	0.784
Average	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3
Std Dev	55.8	56.8	56.5	57.5	58.5	58.2	57.4	58.3	58.0
Correlation	0.726	0.740	0.735	0.750	0.762	0.758	0.748	0.760	0.756
Std Err Pred	52.751	51.644	52.005	50.803	49.687	50.089	50.973	49.904	50.275
Figure Merit	3.009	3.074	3.053	3.125	3.195	3.169	3.114	3.181	3.158

INDEX FINGER ONLY

	----- Calibration Results - Middle 1 -----									
	1-Touch Average	High 1 Low 1	High 1 Low 2	High 1 Low 3	High 2 Low 1	High 2 Low 2	High 2 Low 3	High 3 Low 1	High 3 Low 2	High 3 Low 3
Average	184.3	188.2	186.1	185.6	190.2	188.2	187.6	192.2	190.2	189.6
Std Dev	77.0	64.0	66.2	67.2	65.8	68.1	69.0	67.6	69.9	70.8

- Basic Stats -

Correlation	0.841	0.851	0.847	0.872	0.881	0.876	0.867	0.876	0.872
Std Err Pred	41.811	40.447	41.031	38.130	36.630	37.273	39.131	37.670	38.296
Figure Merit	3.797	3.925	3.869	4.163	4.334	4.259	4.057	4.214	4.145

- With Bias Correction -

Bias	-3.9	-1.8	-1.3	-5.9	-3.8	-3.3	-7.9	-5.9	-5.3
Average	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3
Std Dev	64.0	66.2	67.2	65.8	68.1	69.0	67.6	69.9	70.8
Correlation	0.841	0.851	0.847	0.872	0.881	0.876	0.867	0.876	0.872
Std Err Pred	41.630	40.405	41.012	37.671	36.426	37.129	38.321	37.208	37.929
Figure Merit	3.813	3.929	3.871	4.214	4.358	4.276	4.143	4.267	4.185

- With Slope/Bias Correction -

Slope	1.013	0.990	0.971	1.020	0.996	0.977	0.988	0.966	0.948
Average	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3
Std Dev	64.8	65.6	65.2	67.2	67.8	67.5	66.8	67.5	67.1
Correlation	0.841	0.851	0.847	0.872	0.881	0.876	0.867	0.876	0.872
Std Err Pred	41.622	40.399	40.964	37.647	36.425	37.097	38.313	37.131	37.752
Figure Merit	3.814	3.930	3.875	4.217	4.358	4.279	4.143	4.275	4.205

ALL FINGERS

----- Calibration Results - Middle 2 -----											
1-Touch	High 1	High 1	High 1	High 2	High 2	High 2	High 2	High 3	High 3	High 3	
Average	Low 1	Low 2	Low 3	Low 1	Low 2	Low 3	Low 1	Low 2	Low 3		
Average	184.3	187.9	186.5	185.5	189.9	188.6	187.6	192.6	191.2	190.2	
Std Dev	76.8	67.0	68.1	69.4	68.8	69.9	71.2	71.5	72.6	73.8	
- Basic Stats -											
Correlation	0.733	0.748	0.744	0.752	0.766	0.762	0.750	0.763	0.759		
Std Err Pred	53.405	52.067	52.734	52.110	50.738	51.422	53.314	51.974	52.642		
Figure Merit	2.973	3.049	3.010	3.046	3.129	3.087	2.978	3.054	3.016		
- With Bias Correction -											
Bias	-3.6	-2.2	-1.2	-5.6	-4.3	-3.3	-8.2	-6.9	-5.9		
Average	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3		
Std Dev	67.0	68.1	69.4	68.8	69.9	71.2	71.5	72.6	73.8		
Correlation	0.733	0.748	0.744	0.752	0.766	0.762	0.750	0.763	0.759		
Std Err Pred	53.286	52.021	52.721	51.803	50.558	51.319	52.671	51.516	52.313		
Figure Merit	2.979	3.052	3.011	3.065	3.140	3.093	3.014	3.082	3.035		
- With Slope/Bias Correction -											
Slope	0.840	0.843	0.823	0.839	0.841	0.822	0.805	0.807	0.789		
Average	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3		
Std Dev	56.3	57.4	57.1	57.7	58.8	58.5	57.5	58.6	58.3		
Correlation	0.733	0.748	0.744	0.752	0.766	0.762	0.750	0.763	0.759		
Std Err Pred	52.196	50.912	51.277	50.607	49.323	49.725	50.799	49.576	49.947		
Figure Merit	3.041	3.118	3.096	0.137	3.219	3.193	3.125	3.202	3.178		

INDEX FINGER ONLY

----- Calibration Results - Middle 2 -----											
1-Touch	High 1	High 1	High 1	High 2	High 2	High 2	High 2	High 3	High 3	High 3	
Average	Low 1	Low 2	Low 3	Low 1	Low 2	Low 3	Low 1	Low 2	Low 3		
Average	184.3	187.1	184.6	184.0	189.6	187.1	186.5	191.8	189.3	188.7	
STD Dev	77.0	63.6	66.0	66.9	65.5	67.9	68.9	67.3	69.7	70.6	
- Basic Stats -											
Correlation	0.838	0.857	0.853	0.864	0.881	0.877	0.859	0.876	0.871		
Std Err Pred	42.072	39.624	40.196	39.174	36.532	37.151	40.163	37.590	38.193		
Figure Merit	3.773	4.006	3.949	4.052	4.346	4.273	3.953	4.223	4.157		
- With Bias Correction -											
Bias	-2.8	-0.3	0.3	-5.3	-2.8	-2.2	-7.5	-5.0	-4.4		
Average	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3		
Std Dev	63.6	66.0	66.9	65.5	67.9	68.9	67.3	69.7	70.6		
Correlation	0.838	0.857	0.853	0.864	0.881	0.877	0.859	0.876	0.871		
Std Err Pred	41.981	39.623	40.194	38.808	36.420	37.085	39.454	37.253	37.938		
Figure Merit	3.782	4.007	3.950	4.091	4.359	4.281	4.024	4.261	4.184		
- With Slope/Bias Correction -											
Slope	1.015	1.001	0.982	1.015	0.999	0.980	0.983	0.967	0.950		
Average	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3		
Std Dev	64.6	66.0	65.7	65.5	67.3	67.5	66.1	67.4	67.1		
Correlation	0.838	0.857	0.853	0.864	0.881	0.877	0.859	0.876	0.871		
Std Err Pred	41.970	39.623	40.175	38.795	36.420	37.059	39.436	37.184	37.772		
Figure Merit	3.782	4.007	3.951	4.092	4.359	4.284	4.025	4.269	4.203		

ALL FINGERS

```

----- Calibration Results - Middle 3 -----
1-Touch High 1 High 1 High 1 High 2 High 2 High 2 High 3 High 3 High 3
Average Low 1 Low 2 Low 3 Low 1 Low 2 Low 3 Low 1 Low 2 Low 3
-----
Average 184.3 187.2 185.6 184.9 189.1 187.5 186.7 191.9 190.3 189.6
Std Dev 76.8 67.2 68.2 69.3 68.9 70.0 71.1 71.6 72.7 73.8

- Basic Stats -
Correlation 0.729 0.752 0.747 0.749 0.771 0.766 0.747 0.768 0.763
Std Err Pred 53.794 51.715 52.399 52.324 50.184 50.890 53.540 51.451 52.139
Figure Merit 2.951 3.070 3.030 3.034 3.163 3.119 2.965 3.085 3.045

- With Bias Correction -
Bias -2.9 -1.3 -0.6 -4.8 -3.2 -2.4 -7.6 -6.0 -5.3
Average 184.3 184.3 184.3 184.3 184.3 184.3 184.3 184.3 184.3
Std Dev 67.2 68.2 69.3 68.9 70.0 71.1 71.6 72.7 73.8
Correlation 0.729 0.752 0.747 0.749 0.771 0.766 0.747 0.768 0.763
Std Err Pred 53.714 51.698 52.396 52.106 50.085 50.832 52.997 51.100 51.873
Figure Merit 2.955 3.071 3.030 3.047 3.170 3.123 2.995 3.107 3.060

- With Slope/Bias Correction -
Slope 0.833 0.846 0.827 0.834 0.845 0.827 0.800 0.810 0.794
Average 184.3 184.3 184.3 184.3 184.3 184.3 184.3 184.3 184.3
Std Dev 56.0 57.7 57.3 57.5 59.2 58.8 57.3 58.9 58.6
Correlation 0.729 0.752 0.747 0.749 0.771 0.766 0.747 0.768 0.763
Std Err Pred 52.531 50.614 51.012 50.838 48.897 49.328 51.029 49.195 49.591
Figure Merit 3.022 3.136 3.112 3.123 3.247 3.218 3.111 3.227 3.201

```

INDEX FINGER ONLY

----- Calibration Results - Middle 3 -----										
	1-Touch	High 1	High 1	High 1	High 2	High 2	High 2	High 3	High 3	High 3
	Average	Low 1	Low 2	Low 3	Low 1	Low 2	Low 3	Low 1	Low 2	Low 3
Average	184.3	186.5	183.6	183.3	188.7	185.8	185.5	191.1	188.2	187.9
Std Dev	77.0	63.9	66.2	66.9	65.8	68.1	68.8	67.6	69.9	70.6
- Basic Stats -										
Correlation		0.827	0.858	0.852	0.853	0.882	0.876	0.849	0.877	0.871
Std Err Pred	43.340	39.538	40.384	40.375	36.263	37.184	41.313	37.304	38.200	
Figure Merit	3.663	4.015	3.931	3.932	4.378	4.269	3.843	4.256	4.156	
- With Bias Correction -										
Bias	-2.2	0.7	1.0	-4.4	-1.5	-1.2	-6.8	-3.9	-3.6	
Average	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	
Std Dev	63.9	66.2	66.9	65.8	68.1	68.8	67.6	69.9	70.6	
Correlation	0.827	0.858	0.852	0.853	0.882	0.876	0.849	0.877	0.871	
Std Err Pred	43.285	39.531	40.371	40.128	36.230	37.164	40.747	37.099	38.031	
Figure Merit	3.668	4.016	3.932	3.956	4.382	4.272	3.896	4.279	4.174	
- With Slope/Bias Correction -										
Slope	0.996	0.998	0.981	0.999	0.998	0.981	0.967	0.966	0.950	
Average	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	184.3	
Std Dev	63.7	66.1	65.6	65.7	67.9	67.5	65.4	67.5	67.0	
Correlation	0.827	0.858	0.852	0.853	0.882	0.876	0.849	0.877	0.871	
Std Err Pred	43.285	39.531	40.350	40.128	36.230	37.140	40.687	37.021	37.864	
Figure Merit	3.668	4.016	3.934	3.956	4.382	4.274	3.902	4.288	4.193	

The invention, having been described, it will be apparent to those skilled in the art that the same may be varied in many ways without departing from the spirit and scope of the invention. Any and all such modifications are intended to be included within the scope of the following claims.

CLAIMS

What is Claimed is:

1. A method for calibrating a near infrared (NIR) measurement device to a subject, said method comprising the steps of:

- forming a data set comprising a plurality of data terms for said NIR measurement device;
- augmenting said data set by forming cross-products terms using said data terms;
- forming a plurality of subsets having a first specified number of members randomly selected from said data set;
- evaluating each of said plurality of subsets against a set of reliable measurement results for said subject;
- selecting one of said subsets based on a preselected set of criteria; and
- using said selected set to form an optimal calibration for said device to said subject.

2. The method of claim 1 wherein the step of forming cross-products further comprises forming second and third order terms.

3. The method of claim 1 wherein the step of forming a plurality of subsets sets further comprises the forming of subsets sets having at least one alternative specified number of members, said alternative number(s) unequal to said first number.

4. The method of claim 3 wherein the step of selecting one of said subsets further comprises a comparison of the subsets having said first number of members with the subsets having said alternative number(s) of members.

5. The method of claim 1 wherein the step of selecting one of said subsets further comprises performing a cross validation study for at least one subset.

6. The method of claim 1, wherein said device measures blood glucose levels in said subject.

7. The method of claim 1 wherein said set of reliable measurement results for said subject are taken from more than one of said subject's fingers.

8. The method of claim 7 wherein said set of reliable measurement results is amended by duplicating, at least once, the measurement results taken from any one of said three fingers.

9. The method of claim 1 wherein said set of reliable measurement results is amended by duplicating, at least once, at least one of the measurement results to produce at least one alternative calibration.

5

10. The method of claim 9 wherein said set of reliable measurement results are divided into at least one range of values.

10 11. The method of claim 10 wherein said set of reliable measurement results is divided into a low range, a high range, and middle range.

15 12. The method of claim 11 wherein each of said low, high and middle ranges is further divided into smaller ranges.

20 13. The method of claim 11 wherein said device measures blood glucose levels in said subject and wherein said set of reliable measurement results is divided into ranges below 120 mg/dL, greater than 240 mg/dL, and between 120 and 240 mg/dL.

25 14. The method of claim 10 wherein the step of using said selected set to form an optimal calibration further

comprising using one of said alternative calibrations over each of said ranges of values.

15. The method of claim 1 wherein said data set further
5 comprises non-optical data terms.

16. A method for calibrating a non-invasive NIR blood glucose device measurement to a subject, said method comprising the steps of:

- 10 - forming a data set comprising a plurality of data terms for said NIR measurement device;
- augmenting said data set by forming cross-products terms using said data terms;
- forming a plurality of subsets having at least
15 one specified number of members randomly selected from said data set;
- evaluating each of said plurality of subsets against a set of reliable blood glucose measurements for said subject;
- 20 - selecting one of said sets based on a preselected set of criteria, including the ability of the subset to predict said set of reliable blood glucose measurements for said subject; and

- using said selected set to calibrate said NIR blood glucose measurement device to said subject.


5 17. A non-invasive device for measuring blood glucose levels in a subject, said device comprising:

- means for gathering a plurality of data terms using NIR energy;
- means for storing said plurality of data terms in a data set;
- means for augmenting said data set with at least one cross-product term formed from said data terms and;
- means for forming a plurality of subsets from said data set;
- means for evaluating each of said plurality of subsets against reliable blood glucose level measurements for said subject; and
- means for selecting at least one of said subsets to calibrate said device to said subject.

ABSTRACT

In a method to improve the calibration of a non-invasive, near infrared (NIR) measurement device, a plurality of data terms is formed for the NIR measurement device. Then the codependence of the data terms is evaluated by forming cross-products terms using the data terms. Next, sets of prespecified sizes are randomly formed from the data terms and the cross-product terms. Each of these sets of terms is evaluated by testing the ability of the set to predict a set of accurate measurements using regression analysis. The method then selects one of the sets based on preselected criteria and uses the selected set to calibrate the NIR measurement device.

FIG. 1 (Prior Art)



09617046-071400




FIG. 2 (Prior Art)





FIG. 3

FIG.4

Different Methods Of Calibration File=030AMCG.ALL; 169 Samples



"A"-1st Order (14 OD); "B"-1st+2nd Order
 "C"-1+2+3 Order; "D"-A+Pulse+Td;
 "E"-1+2+P+Td; "F"-B+P+Td

J121B


000120*94071960

FIG. 5

SEC Vs. SECV


Using The 10 Best Calibrations

Using 1st, 2nd, and 3rd Order Terms



J120 Using cal file 039amcg.all. Used Monte Carlo with 1,000,000 random WL regressions. (Analysis done 9/99)

Different Calibration Approaches Using Six DBAs Chosen at Random



For Units 1002, 1012, 1020, 1021, 3013
and 3015. 20 variables were used for all
analyses except for the 14WL. File: J400

Declaration and Power of Attorney for Patent Application

As a below named inventor, I hereby declare that:

My residence, post office address and citizenship are as stated below next to my name,

I believe I am the original, first and sole inventor (if only one name is listed below) or an original, first and joint inventor (if plural names are listed below) of the subject matter which is claimed and for which a patent is sought, on the invention entitled CALIBRATION OF NEAR INFRARED QUANTITATIVE MEASUREMENT DEVICE USING OPTICAL MEASUREMENT CROSS-PRODUCTS, the specification of which

☒ [X] is attached hereto.

☐ [] was filed on _____
Application Serial No. _____
and was amended on _____

I hereby state that I have reviewed and understand the contents of the above-identified specification, including the claims, as amended by any amendment referred to above.

I acknowledge the duty to disclose information which is material to patentability in accordance with Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, § 1.56(a).

I hereby claim foreign priority benefits under Title 35, United States Code, § 119 of any foreign application(s) for patent or inventor's certificate listed below and have also identified below any foreign application for patent or inventor's certificate having a filing date before that of the application on which priority is claimed:

Prior Foreign Application(s)

			Priority Claimed	
			<input type="checkbox"/> []	<input type="checkbox"/> []
(Number)	(Country)	(Day/Month/Year)	Yes	No
_____	_____	_____		

Prior Foreign Application(s)

			Priority Claimed	
			<input type="checkbox"/> []	<input type="checkbox"/> []
(Number)	(Country)	(Day/Month/Year)	Yes	No
_____	_____	_____		

I hereby claim the benefit under Title 35, United States Code § 119(e) of any United States provisional application(s) listed below.

(Application Serial No.) (Filing Date)

I hereby claim the benefit under Title 35, United States Code, § 120 of any United States application(s) listed below and, insofar as the subject matter of each of the claims of this application is not disclosed in the prior United States application in the manner provided by the first paragraph of Title 35, United States Code, § 112, I acknowledge the duty to disclose material information as defined in Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, 1.56(a) which occurred between the filing date of the prior application and the national or PCT international filing date of this application:


(Application Serial No.)	(Filing Date)	(Status)
(Application Serial No.)	(Filing Date)	(Status)


I or we hereby appoint the following attorneys to prosecute this application and to transact all business in the Patent and Trademark Office connected therewith, and request that all correspondence about the application be addressed to ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & KURZ, p.c., Suite 701-E, 555 13th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C 20004

G. Franklin Rothwell, Reg. No. 18,125
 E. Anthony Figg, Reg. No. 27,195
 Barbara G. Ernst, Reg. No. 30,377
 George R. Repper, Reg. No. 31,414
 Bart G. Newland, Reg. No. 31,282
 Vincent M. DeLuca, Reg. No. 32,408
 Joseph A. Hynds, Reg. No. 34,627
 Robert J. Jondle, Reg. No. 33,915
 Jeffrey L. Ihnen, Reg. No. 28,957
 Don M. Kerr, Reg. No. 22,720
 Glenn E. Karta, Reg. No. 30,649
 Mark I. Bowditch, Reg. No. 40,315
 Jeffrey W. Rennecker, Reg. No. 40,784
 Stephen A. Saxe, Reg. No. 38,609
 Richard Wydeven, Reg. No. 39,881
 Martha Cassidy, Reg. No. 44,066
 Julie A. Nelson, Reg. No. 46,301
 Kevin G. Shaw, Reg. No. 43,110

I hereby declare that all statements made herein of my own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true; and further that these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code, and that such willful false statements may

jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issuing thereon.

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	SIGNATURE	DATE
David E. Honigs		7/30/2000
RESIDENCE	CITIZENSHIP	
11772 Meadowlark Avenue, Hagerstown, MD 21742		U.S.
POST OFFICE ADDRESS		
(Same as Above)		

SECOND NAMED INVENTOR	SIGNATURE	DATE
Robert D. Rosenthal		6/23/2000
RESIDENCE	CITIZENSHIP	
9805 Hallowell Place, Montgomery Village, MD 20886		U.S.
POST OFFICE ADDRESS		
(Same as Above)		

004720 9407 004720 071400